



For The Honourable Judge John Gleeson From Michael Mason -Mahon
CKMDM

02/08/2016 01:44 PM

United Kingdom
Mobile: 0044 7834763544
Mobile: 0044 7448770801
E-mail: ckmdm@aol.com

8 February 2016

To The Honourable Judge John Gleeson
United States Courthouse
225 Cadman Plaza East
Brooklyn, New York 11201

Dear Judge John Gleeson

As a shareholder in HSBC Holdings plc and an interested party to these court proceedings and the effect these proceedings will have on HSBC Holdings plc and every customer and shareholder alike worldwide.

If I may ask The Honourable Judge John Gleeson and the court for your indulgence, this case is about the unsealing of the Monitors Report, which other shareholders full support.

One of the main points of unsealing the Monitors Report in the U. S. A. only is fine, American citizens will be able to judge themselves if the Monitor and the DOJ are in full control of stopping the HSBC Bank USA, N. A. and HSBC Holdings plc from committing further illegal and criminal offences/acts against the American people on American Soil.

The American people have the right to under the First Amendment to see the Monitors Report, the Report should show that HSBC breached the Deferred Prosecution Agreement, if not then the Report is flawed. I do refer to **Breach of Agreement** Section 16 and has the DOJ failed to enforced the DPA?

If I may ask The Honourable Judge John Gleeson and the court for your indulgence, to challenge the submission made by Sullivan & Cromwell on behalf of HSBC and to challenge the submission made by the DOJ.

I refer to Breach of the Agreement

Will Sullivan & Cromwell on behalf of HSBC Holdings state: Was/Is the Chairman of HSBC Holdings plc Mr Douglas Flint aware of any illegal and/or criminal acts/offensives being committed by the HSBC Parties breaching The Deferred Prosecution Agreement Section 16.

Is Sullivan & Cromwell acting on behalf of HSBC willing to produce Mr Douglas Jardine Flint Group Chairman before the court to confirm he is or he is not aware of any illegal and/or criminal acts/offensives being committed by the HSBC Parties anywhere in the world which involves breaching The Deferred Prosecution Agreement Section 16.

Sullivan & Cromwell Submission

1) Sullivan & Cromwell states/argues on behalf of HSBC: "Those documents together number more than 550 pages, and they are based on the Monitor's review of a considerable volume of confidential information from both inside and outside the United States".

2) Sullivan & Cromwell states/argues on behalf of HSBC: But two weeks is simply not enough time to conduct the close review and extensive consultation with various regulators that will be necessary to complete that exercise in a responsible manner.

3) Accordingly, at a minimum this Court should allow the parties an additional 30 days to submit a proposed redacted version of the Report.

3 (a) On the other hand, it will cause no material harm to any other party to maintain the current confidentiality of the entire Report (which summarizes the Monitor's 2014 review and has been under seal since it was filed with the Court eight months ago) solely for the additional time it takes for the Second Circuit to review this important issue.

Response

1) How many people are Sullivan & Cromwell willing to put to work on complying with the Court Order?

If Sullivan & Cromwell only allowed six Lawyers, each Lawyer would have to scrutinize 7.6 pages per day for twelve days to comply with the Order.

The possible cost to comply with the Court Order six Lawyer's \$400-500 per hour eight hours per day. Estimated costs per day \$19,200 - \$24,000. Estimates costs for twelve days \$230,400 - \$288,000.

Which is a very small for HSBC to pay for complying with the court Order and in particular the amount of profit HSBC is making per day.

2) Where in the Order has it stated that Sullivan & Cromwell need to undertake "extensive consultation with various regulators"?

The statement by Sullivan & Cromwell in their submission to the Court, needing another 30 days to submit a proposed redacted version of the report, I have to seriously question this fact.

How many people are Sullivan & Cromwell willing to put to work on complying with the Court Order?

If Sullivan & Cromwell only allowed six Lawyers, each Lawyer would have 7.6 pages per day for twelve days to comply with the Order.

Is Sullivan & Cromwell attempting to delay with complying with the court Order?

Is Sullivan & Cromwell attempting to delay with complying with the court Order so they are able to take this case and the Court Order issued by The Honourable Judge John Gleeson, to another court?

3) The Honourable Judge John Gleeson Order did state the time frame in which Sullivan & Cromwell had to comply with the Order.

3 (a) I have to seriously question this state by Sullivan & Cromwell, it will cause further harm to Mr Moore and to the American people who HSBC may have committed illegal and criminal acts/ offences against.

I. Background

[Sullivan & Cromwell state/argues on behalf of HSBC](#) "No party joined Mr. Moore's motion during that time period".

Response

I refer to my previous letter to The Honourable Judge John Gleeson.

HSBC Will Suffer Irreparable Harm Absent a Stay.

Response

Did HSBC show any thought or concerns for the American People who have/will Suffer Irreparable Harm when Laundering Drug Cartel's Money or when HSBC did Illegally move over \$19 Billion for Iran?

No one else except HSBC Bank USA, N. A. and HSBC Holdings plc did this harm, to themselves by engaging in Illegal and Criminal Acts on American Soil and against the American People.

It is to late in the day, giving any consideration for the sufferings of HSBC, HSBC inflicted this suffering and irreparable harm by making a decision to knowingly and willingly to engage in Illegal and Criminal practices on American Soil.

DOJ Submission

1) Monitor conducted country reviews –Canada, Philippines, Malaysia, Hong Kong, and Oman

2) The Report and Appendix total 571 pages, it would be extremely difficult for the government to meaningfully comply with the February 12,2016, deadline. Based on the foregoing, the government respectfully requests a 30-day extension from the February 12, 2016, deadline.

Response

1) Did the DOJ have the right or obtained Authorisation from the Monitor or the Regulator's in each of the countries to name these countries concerning the Monitor's

I am very concerned about the DOJ, unwillingness to enforce the DPA and the violation an breaches HSBC have and are still committing on US Soil.

2) According to Sullivan & Cromwell Submission they have only 550 pages, yet the DOJ is presenting the same argument as Sullivan & Cromwell.

I refer to my answer to Sullivan & Cromwell Submission requiring a further 30 days.

I do seriously question the behaviour of the DOJ and are the acting in the best interests of the American people.

Public Statements by HSBC Parties

HSBC states "HSBC takes compliance with the law, wherever it operates.

Is this not a breach by HSBC of the DPA, if HSBC did make the statement, since July 2013. I do refer to Section 21 of the DPA **Public Statements by HSBC Parties**

Forfeiture Amount

DPA Section 7 The HSBC Parties hereby acknowledge that at least \$881,000,000 was involved in transactions, in violation of Title 18, United States Code

Response

Is this not the same figure that was mentioned in Senator Carl Levin's report?

At least \$881 million, does this mean it could of been \$ Billions, one has to ask what type of investigation did the DOJ undertake? How much profit did HSBC Parties make from laundering Drug Cartel's Money?

Is the DOJ willing to require Mr Douglas Jardine Flint HSBC Group Chairman to appear in court to confirm he is or he is not aware of any illegal and/or criminal acts/offensives being committed by the HSBC Parties anywhere in the world which involves breaching The Deferred Prosecution Agreement Section 16?

If the DOJ is unwilling to require Mr Douglas Jardine Flint to appear in court, then it is vital that the Monitors report is unseal for the American people.

The behaviour of HSBC Holdings plc in the USA

I would like to take this opportunity to reference the behaviour of HSBC Holdings plc in the USA.

HSBC Holdings plc new of the Laws and Regulations they to comply with, for doing business in the U.S. A.

HSBC Parties decide made a decision to knowingly and willingly to engage in Illegal and Criminal practices on American Soil.

Monitor's Report

I do believe there is more than sufficient evidence to support the unsealing Monitor's Report.

One final point:

What right has this Foreign company like HSBC Holdings plc, to commit such Heinous Crimes against the American People.

America is the Land of the Free and the Home of the Brave.

Not the Land of the Victims of HSBC Holdings plc and the Home for HSBC Bank USA, N. A. and HSBC Holdings plc to commit their Illegal and Criminal practices on American Soil.

Please allow me to offer my sincere apologies to The Honourable Judge John Gleeson and the court, for taking up so much of your time.

Your sincerely

Michael Mason-Mahon